UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/554,031	08/16/2006	David Watt Stevenson	031749/301402	7840

826   7590   10/17/2007

ALSTON & BIRD LLP
BANK OF AMERICA PLAZA
101 SOUTH TRYON STREET, SUITE 4000
CHARLOTTE, NC 28280-4000

EXAMINER
HUR, ECE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
4135	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/17/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary		10/554,031	STEVENSON, DAVID WATT	
		Examiner	Art Unit	
		ECE HUR	4135	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>20 October 2005</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>50-72</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>1-49</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>50-72</u> is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) <u>50-63</u> is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>10/20/2005</u> is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☒ All   b)☐ Some *   c)☐ None of:

        1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>09/20/2007, 10/20/2005</u>.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This action is responsive to application filed on October 20, 2005 and IDS filed on October 20, 2005 and September 20, 2007 in which Claims 1-49 are canceled and 50-72 are presented for examination. This application is a new PCT National Stage application of PCT/GB04/01749 that was filed on April 23, 2004. Applicant is claiming foreign priority for the application GB0309174.1 filed on April 23, 2003.

Status of Claims

Claims 1-49 are cancelled in the case.
Claims 50-72 are pending in the case. Claims 50, 58, 59, 64, 69 and 71 are the independent Claims.
Claims 50-63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.
Claims 50-72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e).

Information Disclosure Statement Acknowledgement

The information disclosure statements filed on October 20, 2005 and September 20, 2007 are in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609. It has been placed in the application file, the information referred to therein has been considered as to the merits.

Priority Acknowledgement

Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d). Receipt is acknowledged of certified copy of GB0309174.1 filed

on October 20, 2005 and GB0309174.1 filed on April 23, 2003, submitted under 35

U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Specification Objection

The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to

determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is

requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the

specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly

claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 50-63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being failing to

particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the

invention.

Regarding Claims 50-63, Claims 50-63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second

paragraph, Independent Claim 50 recites "information/text "as being failing to

particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter. Claim 58 recites the phrase

"the", such as "the profile". It is not clear if it refers to "a content profile" or not. Examiner

suggests to change the "the profile" to "the content profile". Claim 59 recites "the

information group", there is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims.

Claim 68 recites "the documents", it is not clear which documents. There is insufficient

antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims.

Regarding claims 50 and 59, the phrase "for example" renders the claims 50 and 59

indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitation(s) following the phrase are part of

the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form

the basis for the rejections under this section made in this office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless —
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 50-72 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Banerjee et al., US 6,983,273.

Regarding Claim 50, Banerjee in US 6,983,273 discloses the claimed aspect of

identifying a measure of similarity between the activities of a plurality of parties, for

example companies, using groups of information/text associated with, and

representative of those parties on the world wide web or in other information stores, the

method comprising deriving a content profile for the information group of each party,

and comparing the profiles to identify a degree of similarity in FIG. 7 and FIG. 8,

wherein a results page shown on a portion of a computer display (79), in which a search

for sites regarding child health care was performed and five results items or "hits" (71-

75) are given, each with a short summary or the first few words for the linked site page,

a relevance score, and a URL. As per typical search engine results, these results are

sorted by degree of relevance. (Banerjee, Column 9, lines 24-30).

Regarding Claim 51, most of the limitations have been met in the rejection of claim

50. See details for Claim 50 rejection. Banerjee discloses the claimed aspect of deriving

the content profile of a group involves analyzing every group of text to identify key

topics, allocating a measure of importance to identified key topics, and using that

measure and the identified topics to generate the content profile, wherein a web site is

added to the engine's categories and keyword lists as suggested and as determined by

analysis of the content of the submitted web site (e.g. word frequency analysis, hyper

text header tags, etc.) and measure of important is determined by word frequency

analysis or hyper text header tags analysis. (Banerjee, Column 1, lines 53-57).

Regarding Claim 52, most of the limitations have been met in the rejection of claim

50. See details for Claim 50 rejection. Banerjee discloses the claimed aspect of

analyzing is based on a word frequency analysis and comprises selecting topics which

have a higher than average frequency of occurrence in the group than in the native

language of the group, wherein a web site is added to the engine's categories and

keyword lists as suggested and as determined by analysis of the content of the

submitted web site (e.g. word frequency analysis, hyper text header tags, etc.) and

measure of important is determined by word frequency analysis or hyper text header

tags analysis. (Banerjee, Column 1, lines 53-57).

Regarding Claim 53, most of the limitations have been met in the rejection of claim

51. See details for Claim 51 rejection. Banerjee discloses the claimed aspect of

analyzing involves discarding topics that are not related to important key words, wherein

important keywords determination is based on word frequency (Banerjee, Column 1,

lines 53-57) and in FIG.4, the process (40) of associating characteristic factors with

linked sites is presented. When a search engine receives (41) an initial submission for

indexing content from a linked site (or upon re-indexing of a previously indexed linked

site), the actual content of the linked site is analyzed (42) by retrieving one or more

pages and web objects from the linked site server (36). Well-known processes such as

word statistical analysis can be used to determine the keywords to be indexed to the

site. (Banerjee, Column 8, lines 1-8). Furthermore, in FIG. 5, the logical process (50)

during operation in cooperation with a search process is shown. When a set of search

criteria is received (51) from a client computer (32) such as a set of keywords, phrases,

or QBE example, the search engines general index (34) is searched (52). The ratings

index (34') is accessed for each results item (e.g. for each "hit"), and a results page is created with the summaries and one or more associated characteristics icons or symbols for each result item. Applicant should duly note that the unrelated topics are not shown as hits.

Regarding Claim 54, most of the limitations have been met in the rejection of Claim 51. See details for Claim 51 rejection. Banerjee discloses the claimed aspect of determining a list of words related to each of a plurality of key topics identified in the group, wherein a web site is added to the engine's categories and keyword lists as suggested and as determined by analysis of the content of the submitted web site (e.g. word frequency analysis, hyper text header tags, etc.) and measure of important is determined by word frequency analysis or hyper text header tags analysis. (Banerjee, Column 1, lines 53-57).

Banerjee discloses the claimed aspect of determining whether each key topic appears in the list of related words for any of the other key topics in the group and discarding any of the key topics where the key topics does not appear in the list of related words for any other of the key topics, in FIG.4, the process (40) of associating characteristic factors with linked sites is presented. When a search engine receives (41) an initial submission for indexing content from a linked site (or upon re-indexing of a previously indexed linked site), the actual content of the linked site is analyzed (42) by retrieving one or more pages and web objects from the linked site server (36). Well-known processes such as word statistical analysis can be used to determine the

keywords to be indexed to the site. (Banerjee, Column 8, lines 1-8). Furthermore, in

FIG. 5, the logical process (50) during operation in cooperation with a search process is

shown. When a set of search criteria is received (51) from a client computer (32) such

as a set of keywords, phrases, or QBE example, the search engines general index (34)

is searched (52). The ratings index (34') is accessed for each results item (e.g. for each

"hit"), and a results page is created with the summaries and one or more associated

characteristics icons or symbols for each result item. Applicant should duly note that the

unrelated topics are not shown as hits.

Regarding Claim 55, most of the limitations have been met in the rejection of claim

51. See details for Claim 51 rejection. Banerjee discloses the claimed aspect of

comparing comprises counting the number of topics common to the profiles of each

party in FIG. 7 and FIG. 8, wherein a relevance percentage is determined based on

counting the number of keywords common to each hit list.

Furthermore, also Dedhia, in US 20030212669 discloses the claimed aspect of

comparing comprises counting the number of topics common to the profiles of each

party in FIG. 6, wherein all of the filtered relevant product catalog descriptions are

ranked based on the frequency and importance of these terms with respect to its

category (6.3). Applicant should duly note in such a ranking system counting is used to

determine the frequency.

Regarding Claim 56, most of the limitations have been met in the rejection of claim 51. See details for Claim 51 rejection. Banerjee discloses the claimed aspect of comparing the profiles involves comparing the measures of importance for each key topic in FIG. 7 and FIG.8, wherein each link is sorted based on relevance percentage.

Regarding Claim 57, most of the limitations have been met in the rejection of claim 51. See details for Claim 51 rejection. Banerjee discloses the claimed aspect of comparing involves calculating an aggregated comparison across all topics common between the profiles being compared in Table 2, wherein a web surfer performs a keyword search, such as looking for sites containing the keywords "childhood" and "medical treatments", a results "page" is provided by the search engine to the web surfer which typically includes a short description of each site (or the first few words for the site's main page), a hyperlink to each site's web server, and a relevance ranking, as shown in Table 2. (Banerjee, Column 2, lines 25-31). Applicant should duly note that in order to sort by relevance aggregated comparison is performed.

Regarding Claim 58, Banerjee discloses the claimed aspect of measuring the similarity of groups of electronic text comprising determining a content profile for each of a plurality of groups of text based electronic documents and comparing the profiles to identify a degree of similarity in FIG. 7 and FIG. 8, wherein a results page shown on a portion of a computer display (79), in which a search for sites regarding child health care was performed and five results items or "hits" (71- 75) are given, each with a short

summary or the first few words for the linked site page, a relevance score, and a URL. As per typical search engine results, these results are sorted by degree of relevance. (Banerjee, Column 9, lines 24-30).

Regarding Claim 59, Banerjee discloses the claimed aspect of a system in FIG.1-FIG.3, wherein a generalized computing platform architecture, such as a personal computer, server computer, personal digital assistant, web-enabled wireless telephone, or other processor-based device is illustrated. Furthermore, an organization of systems including a web browser, an enhanced search engine server, one or more linked sited servers, and one or more ratings servers are illustrated. The rejection for Claim 50 applies to Claim 59. See for details Claim 50.

Regarding Claim 60, most of the limitations have been met in the rejection of claim 59. See details for Claim 59 rejection. The rejection for Claim 51 applies to Claim 60. See for details Claim 51.

Regarding Claim 61, most of the limitations have been met in the rejection of claim 59. See details for Claim 59 rejection. The rejection for Claim 52 applies to Claim 61. See for details Claim 52.

Regarding Claim 62, most of the limitations have been met in the rejection of claim 60. See details for Claim 60 rejection. The rejection for Claim 53 applies to Claim 62. See for details Claim 53.

Regarding Claim 63, most of the limitations have been met in the rejection of claim 60. See details for Claim 60 rejection. The rejection for Claim 54 applies to Claim 63. See for details Claim 54.

Regarding Claim 64, Banerjee discloses the claimed aspect of profiling a group or collection of electronic text, the method comprising analyzing every group of text in the collection to identify key topics and allocating a measure of importance to identified key topics, and using that measure to generate a topic profile that includes a plurality of topic identifiers, wherein a web site is added to the engine's categories and keyword lists as suggested and as determined by analysis of the content of the submitted web site (e.g. word frequency analysis, hyper text header tags, etc.) and measure of important is determined by word frequency analysis or hyper text header tags analysis. (Banerjee, Column 1, lines 53-57).

Banerjee discloses the claimed aspect of an indication of the importance of each of the topics identified to the collection as a whole or in part, wherein a web site is added to the engine's categories and keyword lists as suggested and as determined by analysis of the content of the submitted web site (e.g. word frequency analysis, hyper text header tags, etc.) and measure of important is determined by word frequency

analysis or hyper text header tags analysis. (Banerjee, Column 1, lines 53-57).

Furthermore, Banerjee discloses an indication of importance in FIG. 7 and FIG. 8,

wherein relevance ranking is provided for each web site.

Regarding Claims 65 and 66, most of the limitations have been met in the rejection

of claim 64. See details for Claim 64 rejection. Banerjee discloses the claimed aspect of

group of electronic document text comprises pages of a web site in FIG. 7 and FIG. 8,

wherein a listing of web sites are illustrated.

Banerjee discloses the claimed aspect of downloading each page of the site in order

to do the step of analyzing in FIG.4, wherein when a search engine receives (41) an

initial submission for indexing content from a linked site (or upon re-indexing of a

previously indexed linked site), the actual content of the linked site is analyzed (42) by

retrieving one or more pages and web objects from the linked site server (36). Well-

known processes such as word statistical analysis can be used to determine the

keywords to be indexed to the site. Keyword lists may be used to categorize the content

of the site. (Banerjee, Column 8, lines 3-10).

Regarding Claim 67, most of the limitations have been met in the rejection of claim

64. See details for Claim 64 rejection. Banerjee, discloses the claimed aspect of a step

of analyzing is based on a word frequency analysis which comprises identifying key

topics by selecting topics which have a higher than average frequency in the group than

in the native language of the group as a whole, wherein a web site is added to the

engine's categories and keyword lists as suggested and as determined by analysis of the content of the submitted web site (e.g. word frequency analysis, hyper text header tags, etc.) and measure of important is determined by word frequency analysis or hyper text header tags analysis. (Banerjee, Column 1, lines 53-57).

Regarding Claim 68, most of the limitations have been met in the rejection of claim 64. See details for Claim 64 rejection. Banerjee discloses the claimed aspect of determining a list of words related to each of a plurality of key topics identified in the group, wherein a web site is added to the engine's categories and keyword lists as suggested and as determined by analysis of the content of the submitted web site (e.g. word frequency analysis, hyper text header tags, etc.) and measure of important is determined by word frequency analysis or hyper text header tags analysis. (Banerjee, Column 1, lines 53-57).

Banerjee discloses the claimed aspect of determining whether each key topic appears in the list of related words for any of the other key topics in the group and discarding any of the key topics where the key topics does not appear in the list of related words for any other of the key topics, in FIG.4, the process (40) of associating characteristic factors with linked sites is presented. When a search engine receives (41) an initial submission for indexing content from a linked site (or upon re-indexing of a previously indexed linked site), the actual content of the linked site is analyzed (42) by retrieving one or more pages and web objects from the linked site server (36). Well-known processes such as word statistical analysis can be used to determine the

keywords to be indexed to the site. (Banerjee, Column 8, lines 1-8). Furthermore, in

FIG. 5, the logical process (50) during operation in cooperation with a search process is

shown. When a set of search criteria is received (51) from a client computer (32) such

as a set of keywords, phrases, or QBE example, the search engines general index (34)

is searched (52). The ratings index (34') is accessed for each results item (e.g. for each

"hit"), and a results page is created with the summaries and one or more associated

characteristics icons or symbols for each result item. Applicant should duly note that the

unrelated topics are not shown as hits.

Regarding Claim 69, Banerjee discloses the claimed aspect of a system in FIG.1-

FIG.3, wherein a generalized computing platform architecture, such as a personal

computer, server computer, personal digital assistant, web-enabled wireless telephone,

or other processor-based device is illustrated. Furthermore, an organization of systems

including a web browser, an enhanced search engine server, one or more linked sited

servers, and one or more ratings servers are illustrated.

Banerjee discloses the claimed aspect of profiling a group or collection of electronic

text, the method comprising analyzing every group of text in the collection to identify key

topics and allocating a measure of importance to identified key topics, and using that

measure to generate a topic profile that includes a plurality of topic identifiers, wherein a

web site is added to the engine's categories and keyword lists as suggested and as

determined by analysis of the content of the submitted web site (e.g. word frequency

analysis, hyper text header tags, etc.) and measure of important is determined by word

frequency analysis or hyper text header tags analysis. (Banerjee, Column 1, lines 53-57).

Banerjee discloses the claimed aspect of an indication of the importance of each of the topics identified to the group as a whole, wherein a web site is added to the engine's categories and keyword lists as suggested and as determined by analysis of the content of the submitted web site (e.g. word frequency analysis, hyper text header tags, etc.) and measure of important is determined by word frequency analysis or hyper text header tags analysis. (Banerjee, Column 1, lines 53-57). Furthermore, Banerjee discloses an indication of importance in FIG. 7 and FIG. 8, wherein relevance ranking is provided for each web site.

Regarding Claim 70, most of the limitations have been met in the rejection of claim 69. See details for Claim 69 rejection. Banerjee discloses the claimed aspect of a system in FIG.1-FIG.3, wherein a generalized computing platform architecture, such as a personal computer, server computer, personal digital assistant, web-enabled wireless telephone, or other processor-based device is illustrated. Furthermore, an organization of systems including a web browser, an enhanced search engine server, one or more linked sited servers, and one or more ratings servers are illustrated.

Banerjee discloses the claimed aspect of determining a list of words related to each of a plurality of key topics identified in the group, wherein a web site is added to the engine's categories and keyword lists as suggested and as determined by analysis of the content of the submitted web site (e.g. word frequency analysis, hyper text header

tags, etc.) and measure of important is determined by word frequency analysis or hyper

text header tags analysis. (Banerjee, Column 1, lines 53-57).

Banerjee discloses the claimed aspect of determining whether each key topic

appears in the list of related words for any of the other key topics in the group and

discarding any of the key topics where the key topics does not appear in the list of

related words for any other of the key topics, in FIG.4, the process (40) of associating

characteristic factors with linked sites is presented. When a search engine receives (41)

an initial submission for indexing content from a linked site (or upon re-indexing of a

previously indexed linked site), the actual content of the linked site is analyzed (42) by

retrieving one or more pages and web objects from the linked site server (36). Well-

known processes such as word statistical analysis can be used to determine the

keywords to be indexed to the site. (Banerjee, Column 8, lines 1-8). Furthermore, in

FIG. 5, the logical process (50) during operation in cooperation with a search process is

shown. When a set of search criteria is received (51) from a client computer (32) such

as a set of keywords, phrases, or QBE example, the search engines general index (34)

is searched (52). The ratings index (34') is accessed for each results item (e.g. for each

"hit"), and a results page is created with the summaries and one or more associated

characteristics icons or symbols for each result item. Applicant should duly note that the

unrelated topics are not shown as hits.

Regarding Claim 71, Banerjee discloses the claimed aspect of a system for allowing

navigation within a group of electronic documents, such as a subset of the world-wide

web, the said system capable of automatically presenting on a screen or display a

plurality of topic identifiers, together with an indication of the relative importance of the

topics identified, each topic being user selectable, topics being presented in a pre-

determined order, thereby to provide an indication of the importance of the topics to the

group as a whole or in part; and receiving a user selection of a given topic and providing

access to information on the selected topic in response to the user selection in FIG. 7

and FIG. 8, wherein group of electronic documents which are a subset of world-wide

web are displayed on screen 79 and ranked according their relevance percentage.

Furthermore, each electronic document has iconic identifier which gives the

characteristic of each document. Additionally, each document is selectable by clicking

their URL link. (Banerjee, Column 9, lines 24-30).

Regarding Claim 72, most of the limitations have been met in the rejection of claim

71. See details for Claim 71 rejection. Banerjee discloses the claimed aspect of

presenting related group identifiers for identifying one or more related groups of

electronic documents, such as internet or intranet sites, together with an indication or

measure of a similarity between a key topic profile of the first group and each related

group in FIG. 7 and FIG. 8, wherein a results page shown on a portion of a computer

display (79), in which a search for sites regarding child health care was performed and

five results items or "hits" (71- 75) are given, each with a short summary or the first few

words for the linked site page, a relevance score, and a URL. As per typical search

engine results, these results are sorted by degree of relevance. (Banerjee, Column 9,

lines 24-30).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

1) Sciammarella, et al., US 5,886,698, 03/23/1999, "Method for filtering search

results with a graphical squeegee".

2) Tukey, et al., US 5,911,140, 06/08/1999, "Method of ordering document

clusters given some knowledge of user interests".

3) Killmer, US 20020046257, 04/18/2002, "Online Network and Associated

Methods".

4) Dedhia, Aatish et al., US 20030212669 A1, 11/13/2003, "System and method

for context based searching of electronic catalog database, aided with graphical

feedback to the user".

5) Chakrabarti, Soumen et al., US 20010016846 A1, 08/23/2001, "Method for

interactively creating an information database including preferred information

elements, such as, preferred-authority, world wide web pages".

6) Liou, Shih-Ping, US 20020059395 A1, 05/16/2002, "User interface for online

product configuration and exploration".

7) Kincaid, Robert et al., US 20020169764 A1, 11/14/2002, "Domain specific knowledge-based metasearch system and methods of using".

8) Hughes, et al., US 5,991,140, 11/23/1999, "Technique for effectively re-arranging circuitry to realize a communications service".

9) Ryan, et al., US 6,421,675, 07/16/2002, "Search engine".

10) Ryan, Grant James, et al., US 20030088554 A1, 05/08/2003, "Search engine".

11) Newbold, US 7,043,698, 05/09/2006, "Method and system for profiling users based on their relationships with content topics".

12) Goel, US 7,047,229, 05/16/2006, "Searching content on web pages".

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ECE HUR whose telephone number is 571 270-1972. The examiner can normally be reached on MONDAY-THURSDAY 7:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, FRANTZ COBY can be reached on (571) 272-4017. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Ece Hur
E.H./e.h.

October 07, 2007

FRANTZ COBY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Application # 10554031
Claims 1-49 are cancelled in the case.